UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,250	11/26/2003	Thomas M. DiMauro	iMauro 3518.1024-000	
	7590 03/06/200 BROOK, SMITH & RE	EXAMINER		
530 VIRGINIA	ROAD	HUYNH, CARLIC K		
P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, M		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, _ ,		1617		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS 03/06/2007		03/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		A	oplication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10	0/723,250	DIMAURO ET A	DIMAURO ET AL.			
		E	caminer	Art Unit				
			arlic K. Huynh	1617				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	ication appear	s on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on						
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This act	ion is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				•			
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-89</u> are subject to restricti	on and/or elec	tion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers	·						
9)	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.						
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are		ed or b) objected t	o by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ction to the draw	wing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
		•						
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	,		v Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	PTO-948)		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-10, 21-30, 60, 70, and 89, drawn to a method of therapeutically treating an uncoupled resorbing bone, classified in class 514, subclass 171.
 - II. Claims 11-20, 51-59, 61-69, and 80-88, drawn to a kit for treating an osteoporotic bone, classified in class 514, subclass 171.
 - III. Claims 31-40, 41-50, and 71-79, drawn to an osmotic pump implant for providing sustained delivery of a therapeutic agent into a bone, classified in class 514, subclass 171.
- 2. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, (1) other kits can be used with the method of therapeutically treating an uncoupled resorbing bone; and (2) a kit can be used in other treatments, e.g. treatment for high blood pressure and cancer.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. It is noted that while the searches of Groups I and II may be overlapping, there is no reason to believe that the searches would be coextensive. In searching Group I, the

Art Unit: 1617

examiner will be focusing on the method of therapeutically treating an uncoupled resorbing bone and not the kit of Group II. Conversely, in searching Group II, the examiner will be focusing on the patentability of the product and not the process of use of Group I.

3. Inventions III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, (1) other osmotic pump implants can be used with the method of therapeutically treating an uncoupled resorbing bone; and (2) an osmotic pump implant can be used in other treatments, e.g. treatment for high blood pressure and cancer.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. It is noted that while the searches of Groups I and III may be overlapping, there is no reason to believe that the searches would be coextensive. In searching Group I, the examiner will be focusing on the method of therapeutically treating an uncoupled resorbing bone and not the osmotic pump implant of Group III. Conversely, in searching Group III, the examiner will be focusing on the patentability of the product and not the process of use of Group I.

4. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions II and III have different designs and modes of operation because the kit for treating an osteoporotic bone

Art Unit: 1617

of invention II is different from the osmotic pump implant for providing sustained delivery of a therapeutic agent into a bone of invention III.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call to the attorney is not required where: 1) the restriction requirement is complex, 2) the application is being prosecuted pro se, or 3) the examiner knows from past experience that a telephone election will not be made (MPEP § 812.01). Therefore, since this restriction requirement is considered complex, a call to the attorney for telephone election was not made.

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of

Application/Control Number: 10/723,250

Art Unit: 1617

the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 5

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlic K. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-5574. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ckh